# THEOLOGY

VOL. LIII NOVEMBER, 1950 No. 365

## Editorial

IT is often taken for granted by educated Christian people that the day of the tract is over, and that only those strata in English society which are still mentally in the early Victorian age can be expected to take any interest in such ephemeral literature. Evangelistic tracts are undoubtedly out of fashion—and it is extraordinarily difficult to find any suitable for a mass audience of the 1950s—but there is still a tremendous output of pamphlets for use in teaching and visiting the people (just as many Victorian tracts were used not instead of, but to reinforce, a personal approach). Are these publications really a waste of time and money?

There is certainly scope for instruction in the Faith by means of pamphlets. Church leaders often forget how illiterate some of their people are. Many adults in Britain to-day simply cannot concentrate on a serious book—the word "book" often means to them only a magazine of some kind—and a stimulating pamphlet which they will read carefully may suit both their education and their pocket better than a bound volume. Of course such instruction will be very elementary, but it is better than nothing; and if we are to wait until the mass of our population is so well educated that it can understand some of the Christian apologetics now being published, we may as well give them at once Aquinas in the original and leave it at that. Good Christian pamphlets are still needed, and can do a useful job in teaching and helping ordinary folk.

Unfortunately, a considerable proportion of the pamphlets that are issued are both defective in their production and ineffective in their appeal. The Advisory Committee on Christian Pamphlets, which attempts to review all Christian pamphlets issued in this country, has already collected specimens of some 2,500 publications. Only 216 reach the reasonably high standards of format and style which ensure that they are mentioned in this year's *Recommended List*,[1] and though both figures include numbers of scholarly pamphlets which are not designed for popular use, the number of pamphlets of a low standard is a striking indication of wasted energies and money. The same Committee undertook a brief review of religious reading in certain London suburbs, and though this has not yet been completed, it is evident that the vast majority of the adult population of these areas never read any religious literature at all, not even a parish magazine.

We can here suggest only one group of reasons for this failure. No

[1] *Christian Pamphlets: A Select Bibliography*. List No. 3, 1950. Published at 6, Fitzroy Square, London, W.1. 4d. post free.

passages of a messianic character. In Micah iv, 8, to "the hill of the Daughter of Zion" is promised the return of "the former dominion, the kingdom of the Daughter of Jerusalem"; and in verse 10 she is addressed as "a woman in travail," labouring to bring forth; she is to be taken to Babylon, and there the Lord will redeem her. In Zeph. iii, 14-20 there is a similar promise of deliverance through suffering; in verse 14 she is addressed: "Sing, O Daughter of Zion; shout, O Israel; be glad and rejoice with all the heart, O Daughter of Jerusalem," at the prospect of the coming salvation. Similarly Zech. ii, 10: "Sing and rejoice, O Daughter of Zion; for lo, I come and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord"; and Zech. ix, 9 (quoted Matt. xxi, 5 and John xii, 15): "Rejoice greatly, O Daughter of Zion; shout, O Daughter of Jerusalem; behold, thy King cometh unto thee." Compare also Joel ii, 21: "Fear not, O land, be glad and rejoice; for the Lord hath done great things." In three out of the four passages just quoted (not in Zech. ii, 10), the word for "rejoice" in the LXX is χαῖρε, as in Luke i, 28. Dr Sahlin thinks that the summons to Zion to rejoice at the coming salvation became a quasi-liturgical formula; for in Lam. iv, 21-2 it is turned with derisive irony against Edom as a prophecy of final ruin: "Rejoice and be glad, O Daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Uz; the cup shall pass through unto thee also; thou shalt be drunken, and shalt make thyself naked. . . . He will visit thine iniquity, O Daughter of Edom."

In two places in the Old Testament she is heard speaking. In Jer. viii, 19-22 the prophet hears the voice of the exiles: "Behold, the voice of the cry of the Daughter of my people from a land that is very far off"; and in Jer. iv, 31 her voice is heard as of a woman in travail, as in Micah iv, 10. This is best given in a quotation which Dr Sahlin makes from the *Bereshith Rabba*: "How is it known that Messiah is born the same day that the Temple was destroyed? It stands in Isaiah (lxvi, 7), 'Before Zion travailed, she brought forth; before her pain came, she was delivered of a man child.' But in the hour that the sanctuary was destroyed, Israel laboured like a woman in travail, as it stands in Jeremiah (iv, 31), 'I have heard a voice as of a woman in travail, the anguish as of her that bringeth forth her first child, the voice of the Daughter of Zion, that gaspeth for breath, that spreadeth her hands, saying, Woe is me now, for my soul fainteth before the murderers.'"

Finally, Dr Sahlin cites the vision of the woman in 2 (4) Esdras, who in ix, 38-x, 5 is seen lamenting her childlessness; after thirty years of married life she had borne a son, and he had died on his wedding day. The seer tells her that she ought not to grieve so bitterly for a personal sorrow, when "Zion the mother of us all is full of sorrow and is much humbled" (x, 7). Then as he speaks to her of the sorrows of Israel, suddenly there is a change (x, 25); her face shines exceedingly, the earth quakes, and the woman is seen no more, but in place of her is "a city builded" (x, 27). The angel Uriel then explains to him that the woman whom he saw was Zion, and her story which she had told him meant that after thirty (*i.e.*, 3,000)

years Solomon had built the temple, but the destruction of the city and temple had followed. Now, however, he must fear no more, for God has shown him Zion in her future glory (x, 38-59).

Thus the phrase "the Daughter of Zion" stands in the Old Testament for Israel enduring suffering and looking forward to God's coming work of salvation; she is also pictured sometimes as a woman in travail. The personification helps the poet to enter imaginatively into the suffering and faith and hope of God's people. Here is a subject which needs to be followed up: how far does the same effort to enter into the corporate suffering and faith of Israel occur in psalms which we commonly take as describing the sufferings of some individual? Is psalm vi, for instance, really intended to be read as an utterance of the Daughter of Zion? But our immediate question is, does the thought of the Daughter of Zion reappear in the New Testament fulfilment?

II. In Luke i, 28 the angel Gabriel salutes the Virgin Mary with the words *χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη*. Is *χαῖρε* an ordinary word of greeting? It is used as a greeting in Matt. xxvi, 49, xxvii, 29, xxviii, 9; Mark xv, 18; John xix, 3; but never so in Luke, who in x, 5 and xxiv, 36 uses the Old Testament word "peace". Or does it mean, as in the Old Testament passages which have been quoted, "Rejoice"?—"Rejoice, thou to whom the divine *χάρις* has come, thou who art the highly favoured recipient of the promised blessing." The Angel is bringing to her, as the representative of Israel, the Daughter of Zion, the joyful message that the longed-for hour has at last come. He continues, "the Lord is with thee", a phrase used sometimes in the prophets' address to Israel, as in Isa. xli, 10, Jer. xlvi, 28: "Fear not for I am with thee."

But Mary is full of fear, not understanding what sort of salutation this is (29). She is bidden, "Fear not" (*cf.* Joel ii, 21, quoted above); she has found *χάρις* with God, and will bear a Son, whose name shall be Jesus, and He shall be called the Son of the Most High, and He will reign over the house of Jacob for ever, on the throne of David. She asks, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man", I who am a virgin betrothed only as yet, and not yet married, so that I am not yet having intercourse with a husband? The answer is, "The Holy *Ruach* shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow (*ἐπισκιάσει*) thee; therefore the holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." The Greek word for "overshadow" is found in Exod. xl, 35 (LXX) of the Cloud of the Presence overshadowing the Tabernacle, and in Matt. xvii, 5 = Mark ix, 7 = Luke ix, 34 of the Cloud of the Presence at the Transfiguration; in all these cases the reference is to the *Shekhinah*. The Spirit which was to come upon her was the Spirit that was promised to the messianic King (Isa. xi, 2, lxi, 1) and people (Ezek. xxxvi, 27; Joel ii, 28). It is true that the *Shekhinah* is not spoken of in Hebrew writings as resting on an individual person; but it was necessarily otherwise in the unique instance of the coming of the divine Son. So according to St John the *Shekhinah* was revealed when "the Word was made flesh and tabernacled [*ἐσκήνωσεν*] among us and we

beheld his glory". Here then in Luke i, 35 the coming of the divine *Ruach* and of the *Shekhinah* would seem to be just the terms needed to describe the birth, not of some prophet or other servant of God, but of the divine Son Himself being born among men as true man. We might indeed ask the question: If such an idea were present, how else could it be expressed in Hebrew terminology?

The Sign which is given to Mary in verses 36-7 is thoroughly Biblical in style. As in the case of Isaac's birth of the aged Sarah it had been said, "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" (Gen. xviii, 14), so now the aged Elizabeth is with child, and the same phrase is used: "With God no word [*i.e.*, thing] shall be impossible." Mary hesitates no longer, and wholly surrenders herself that in her body the divine purpose may be fulfilled.

The terms which are used by the evangelist in telling the story of the Annunciation thus appear to justify the exegesis which has here been given—namely, that the thought of the Daughter of Zion was present both to the author of the Aramaic or Hebrew document, which is generally taken to underlie Luke i and ii, and to Luke himself.

Similarly it is as the Daughter of Zion that Mary sings *Magnificat*. Her song of thanksgiving is not to be regarded, after our modern manner, as primarily an individual matter, but is merged according to the Biblical style in the thanksgiving of the Chosen People, so that Israel speaks through her. God has "looked on the low estate of his handmaiden"; the word means "humiliation", and not "humility", just as in 2 Esdras ix, 45 and x, 7 we read of Zion's "low estate", her "sorrow" and her "humbled" condition. "All generations shall call me blessed"; for "Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see", things which prophets and kings had not been allowed to see (Luke x, 23). "God has exalted his servant Israel", according to the promises made to the forefathers. Dr Sahlin notes that Hannah's thanksgiving for Samuel's birth, in 1 Sam. ii, is treated in the prophetic targum as the song of Israel.

One more point may be noted in the Lukan nativity-narratives. Symeon says, after his *Nunc Dimittis*, "Behold, this Child is set for the falling and rising again (*πτῶσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν*) of many in Israel, and for a Sign which is spoken against; yea, and a sword shall pierce through thine own soul; that thoughts out of many hearts may be revealed" (ii, 34-5). We are accustomed to take the words about the sword as a prophecy of the sorrows which would come to Mary, as the mother of such a Son, and perhaps after all this is right; they then come as a kind of parenthesis within the prophecy of the Messiah's mission. But it is worth considering whether she is rather thought of here as symbolical of Israel, in which case the meaning is: Symeon rejoices to see the Salvation which the Daughter of Zion had longed to see. But the Son of Man was going to be a sign to that generation (Luke xi, 30); His coming was to bring searchings of heart within Israel, for His word would be a sharp sword, like that of the Servant of the Lord in Isa. xlix, 2, and the sword would pierce Israel's soul; the community of Israel would be divided, for and

against Him, and the thoughts of many hearts would be brought under judgment, and many would fall, and many would come to resurrection (*ἀνάστασιν*) to newness of life.

III. The traces of the thought of the Daughter of Zion in the rest of St Luke's gospel are not so clear as they are in the nativity-narrative. But if Luke had seen it there, it formed part of his outlook; and there are signs that he was aware of it, more than the other synoptists.

But we must start with a quotation which Dr Sahlin gives from the *Pesikta d' Rab Kahana*, 22. 2: "The radiance of the garment with which God shall one day clothe the Messiah shall shine from the one end of the world to the other. . . . And Israel shall say, Blessed is the hour when Messiah was born, blessed the mother's womb from which he proceeded, blessed the generation which shall see these things, blessed the eye which is worthy to behold him. Yea, verily blessed is Israel: what salvation is reserved for her!" If the matter of this Rabbinic text is pre-Christian, it illustrates in a remarkable way more than one gospel saying. Luke xi, 27-8 gains a messianic reference. Here a woman utters a beatitude of true Semitic type upon the Mother of Jesus, and still more upon Him: "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked." He replies, "Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." The words can no longer be taken as having a purely individual and personal reference; the form of the woman's words reflects the hope of the Daughter of Zion, and His reply contains a warning lest the Israel to which the Messiah comes should fail to listen to the word of God which He speaks.

Then there is Luke viii, 19-21, with the parallels, Matt. xii, 46-50, Mark iii, 31-5. His mother and His brethren have come seeking Him, and His reply is that His mother and His brethren are they that hear the word of God and do it (Luke; *cf.* xi, 28, "hear the word of God and keep it", while Matthew has "do the will of my Father which is in heaven", and Mark "do the will of God"). He passes from the thought of the natural family which had been His, to that of the spiritual family of the messianic community, represented in those gathered round Him. It is worth noting that Luke not only assimilates the words of His reply to those of xi, 28, but also introduces into his text the word "see": "thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee". We have noticed in the Rabbinic passage just quoted how Israel desires to see the Messiah. We can compare Luke ii, 26: to Symeon it had been revealed "that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ"; ii, 30, "Mine eyes have seen thy salvation"; and x, 23, "Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see," things which prophets and kings had desired in vain to see. St Luke seems here to be using the word "see", not as a colourless synonym for "to meet", but as a highly significant word.

Another Lukan text, xiii, 16, may perhaps contain an allusion to the Daughter of Zion, though here there is no special connexion with His mother Mary. Jesus has healed on the Sabbath day a

woman who was "bowed together, and could in no wise lift herself up" (xiii, 11); and He justifies His action to the Pharisees with the words: "Ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, to have been loosed from this bond on the day of the Sabbath?" The term "daughter of Abraham" is used not infrequently of Israel in the Rabbinic literature. It is further altogether natural that Jesus should see in the afflicted woman before Him not only an individual sufferer, but also a type of the diseased nation of Israel to which He has come to bring healing and salvation. We may recall Ps. cxlvi 7-8: "The Lord looseth the prisoners; the Lord openeth the eyes of the blind; the Lord raiseth up them that are bowed down," as one of the texts which underlie Matt. xi, 5=Luke vii, 22: "The blind receive their sight, the lame walk", etc. As He saw each exorcism as a personal conflict with Satan (Mark iii, 23-7, Luke xi, 17-22), so to Him the cure of this woman would be both a typical instance and a symbol of His whole ministry; He declares the Sabbath to be the appropriate day for it, because to Israel there has now come the true Sabbath, with its healing and peace.

IV. Does the idea expressed in the term "Daughter of Zion" occur elsewhere in the New Testament? We think at once of Rev. xii: the "woman arrayed with the sun" travails in birth, like the Daughter of Zion in Micah and Jeremiah; she is plainly the Israel within which the Messiah was born; but she is at the same time Mary, because the Messiah has been born and she has been His mother.

Then there is St John's gospel in which Jesus twice meets with His mother, though in neither case is she named, any more than in Rev. xii. In both cases there appears to be, as commonly in this gospel, a spiritual meaning behind the natural meaning, and the Mother of Jesus is at once the historical Mary and the representative of old Israel, the Daughter of Zion. Dr Sahlin's exposition is as follows. At the Marriage at Cana, she says to Him: "They have no wine" (ii, 3); and "wine" in Jewish thought is often a symbol for the New Age, the Kingdom of God. Here then the Daughter of Zion expresses her longing desire for the eschatological renewal which the Messiah will effect; but He rebukes her impatience, for His hour is not yet come. Yet He performs the miracle of the Wine. The Daughter of Zion's longing for the messianic renewal, and her preparedness for it, have hastened the time; the Wine is there, in a miraculous manner, and this is the first Sign that Jesus does, and manifests forth His glory, and His disciples believe on Him (ii, 11). She is described as the Mother of Jesus and addressed as "Woman"; we may compare the use of "woman" in the vision in 2 Esdras ix, 38, and of "Zion our mother" (x, 7).

In John xix, 26 f. the words "woman" and "mother of Jesus" are used in the same way. The scene is intended not only to be visualized as an actual event, but has in addition a symbolical meaning. Jesus says to His mother, "Woman, behold thy son," and to St John, "Behold thy mother," thus commending them to one another. It is

not sufficient to say that Jesus had a special personal affection for St John, as the disciple whom He loved; that is a modernizing, psychological interpretation, and may well be alien to the evangelist's thought. Rather, the background of the phrase lies in Old Testament texts such as Isa. xli, 8, "Thou Israel my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend," and Isa. xlii, i, "Behold my servant whom I uphold, my chosen in whom my soul delighteth." As Israel was God's chosen, and is His well-beloved son, so is John, whose name means "God is gracious"; John represents the messianic people, the Church of Christ. So then, at the cross Jesus commends to one another His mother and His beloved disciple, the Daughter of Zion and His own messianic community; the ancient People of God and the new Church stand to one another as mother and son. Zion belongs now to the Ecclesia, and the Ecclesia is Zion's true heir. The ancient People of God has now played its part out, and the New Covenant of Christ and the Church replaces the Old Covenant of Yahweh with Zion. Hence it is natural that a little later Jesus utters his τετέλεσται: it is accomplished.

Thus in the first of the two Johannine scenes the Daughter of Zion is confronted with the Messiah, and in her presence manifests forth His glory; in the second, the Daughter of Zion is replaced by the Ecclesia, the new messianic People of God, the Church.

Finally there is the nativity-narrative in Matt. i, 18-25. Plainly the whole narrative presupposes the Virgin Birth; it is impossible to imagine an earlier story into which the idea of the Virgin Birth was introduced by the evangelist, for if all that relates to the Virgin Birth is removed from the story, there is no story left. Yet the intention of the evangelist is not to prove the Virgin Birth of Jesus from the prophecy of Isa. vii; for any such attempt would be highly unconvincing, since the Hebrew text of Isa. vii, 14 read *ha 'almah*, the young woman, not *ha bethulah*, the virgin; and further, the evangelist's emphasis plainly lies on the two names of the Child: Jesus, who shall "redeem Israel from all his sins" (from Ps. cxxx, 8), and *Immanuel*, God with us. This name Immanuel is clearly important to the evangelist, for it reappears in the last words of his gospel: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." As for the Virgin Birth, it would seem that the evangelist is not proving it, but simply accepting the known tradition.

Have we perhaps got an answer to the puzzling question, why the LXX translators rendered *ha 'almah* as "virgin"? Were they thinking of the Virgin Daughter of Zion, of whom Messiah was to be born? It is implied that Isa. vii, 14 was interpreted messianically in pre-Christian times, and there is no evidence of this. But it would be hard to think that such a passage was omitted from the Jewish collections of messianic prophecies, which reckoned them as 460 in all, and not at all surprising if it was expunged from the list after the Christian era, and allusions to it suppressed.

V. All right exegesis must begin with the effort to learn what was in the mind of the writer; only after this has been done can conclusions safely be drawn about the events which he describes. We

have sought to show that the identification of the Mother of Jesus with the Daughter of Zion was in the mind of St Luke, and was known to other New Testament writers. But there is every reason to think that it was in the mind of our Lord Himself, and of His mother; for the ideas with which we have been dealing belong wholly to the thought of the Palestinian Judaism in which He grew up. Indeed we may say that if our Lord knew Himself to be the Saviour promised by the Prophets and the Fulfiller of the hope of Israel, He would inevitably interpret the prophetic texts about the Daughter of Zion in the light of that which had been accomplished in His own birth; and that if He was virgin-born, His mother would inevitably see her own vocation in the light of the prophecies which spoke of the Virgin Daughter of Zion travailing with child.

The Church, acknowledging the Virgin Birth, has naturally paid high honour to her who was chosen by God from Israel and from humanity, that of her He should take human flesh; for, as the Incarnation of the Son of God is the central event in the history of the world, so His human mother has a cosmic function. Round the veneration paid to Mary bitter controversy has raged; the ground of the objection has always been that through the influence of pagan cults, assisted by a mistaken identification of her with the Divine Wisdom, the Mother of Jesus has been treated in effect as a goddess. On the other side, a wise orthodoxy always insists on the close relation of Mary to the Church which is Christ's Body, a point which often lies beyond the range of the objector's vision.

Just at this point the identification of Mary with the Daughter of Zion (that is, with the Church of the old Israel, which, when the messianic hope had been fulfilled, was to become the Body of Christ) can help to remove the offence, by bringing the cult of Mary into direct relation to the Biblical tradition; she is the flowering of the tree of Israel, the Woman who is in the fullest sense "an Israelite indeed". This is traditional enough; one of the antiphons for August 15 hails her as the Daughter of Jerusalem; and Dr Sahlin quotes from an Easter hymn in the Liturgy of St Chrysostom: "The Angel said to the highly favoured one, Thou pure virgin, rejoice, and again I say, rejoice; thy Son is risen again on the third day from the grave; rise up, our light, thou New Jerusalem." He refers also to a fifteenth-century altar-piece in the church at Burs, on the island of Gotland in the Baltic, where Christ is represented in the act of crowning His mother, and her crown is in the shape of a city wall with towers and battlements. This is sound typology; for both as the Mary of history and as the representative of the Israel of God, she who had longed for the Messiah's coming sings *Magnificat* in thanksgiving for His birth.

A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.

## The Things which are Cæsar's—I

Whenever one glances over a list of titles to religious books, one realizes how almost impossible it is for writers on such topics to avoid sounding like salesmen of quack medicines. Even a phrase

like *The Ministry of the Layman* suggests that the reader is to be offered a portable guidepost or a neatly packed message.

Even if I had one, which I certainly have not, I am sceptical of the value of such utensils. In the remarks which follow the questions I shall try to answer are more theoretical than practical—namely, What is the Laity? What is the distinction between the Laity and the Priesthood? What is the relation of each to the temporal order? If it is possible to reach conclusions on such matters, which are general, then the question of duty which is always an individual matter may be easier to answer.

For the general duty of the Christian, layman or priest, is as succinct as it is difficult—to love God with all his mind, heart, and soul, and to love his neighbour as himself, which in terms of the individual can also be expressed in the words of the Anglican Catechism: "To do my duty in that state of life, unto which it shall please God to call me."

The distinction between the layman and the priest is peculiar to Christianity, and must therefore arise out of the peculiar meanings given by Christianity to such terms as God, neighbour, love, life, and calling. Let us, then, begin at the beginning with Genesis.

The creation of man is described as a double act. First, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." Man, that is to say, is a natural creature subject like all other creatures to the laws of the natural order. Secondly, "The Lord God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Man, that is, is also a unique creature made in the image of God with self-consciousness and free-will, capable, therefore, of making history.

Because of this uniqueness he is given the power to understand and control the natural order and the responsibility to God for it.

> Have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.
>
> And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them; and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof.
>
> And the Lord God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to dress and to keep it.

The creation of the sexes and thus of human relationships is likewise described as twofold.

> Male and female created he them. And God blessed them and God said unto them: Be fruitful and multiply.

That is to say, as a natural creature, man is related impersonally to others by natural needs which are not his but function through him to maintain life and perpetuate his species. He must devour others to live; if a male he seeks a female to mate with.

> And the Lord God said. It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him.

As a historical creature made in the image of God, man is also a

person—*i.e.*, a member of a class of one—desiring and capable of entering into unique relations with other unique persons. Here the relationship itself is its own reason for being rather than any function beyond itself, and consequently there is no limit to the possible number of such relationships.

If the sexual relationship is a special one, if a man may have only one wife at a time but should have many friends, this is because sexual appetite is the only natural need of his which is at once constant and involves another person, but like all natural appetites is indifferent to the person of the other.

In some circles recently there has been a tendency to see the notion of love as eros or desire for getting and the notion of love as agape or free-giving as incompatible opposites and to identify them with Paganism and Christianity respectively. Such a view seems to me a revival of the Manichean heresy which denies the goodness of the natural order; if it were true all natural affection, all admiration for the strong, all desire to protect the helpless, all wish for self-improvement, would be valueless. This seems not only contrary to common sense, but directly denied by the gospel definition of a neighbour as one who needs you. Further, the very sacrament of Agape, the Holy Eucharist, is in its outward and visible sign an act of eating, the most impersonal and naturally selfish of all acts.

Agape is the fulfilment and correction of eros, not its contradiction. When we speak of eros or natural desire we mean desire which necessarily seems right to us. What the gospel asserts is not that natural desire is necessarily wrong, but that, since man is a historical creature as well as a natural creature, furthermore since he is a fallen creature, the experience of a desire as natural or unnatural is not a sufficient guide.

As a natural creature man has, indeed, not desires but needs. Since nature is at once the realm of necessity and the creation of God, these needs cannot be wrong. As a historical creature man experiences these needs as desires which are historically conditioned; *e.g.*, when hungry he does not desire what he needs, which is so-and-so many calories, but a certain kind of food which by culture and personal history he has come to like. Since history is at once the realm of man's freedom and of his sin, the desires which he feels to be natural are not necessarily good.

The command to love my neighbour as myself commands just that and no more; it does not say that those occasions when the command seems natural to me and I enjoy obeying it—*e.g.*, in loving my wife or my family or my friends—are in any way inferior to those occasions when I find it unnatural—*e.g.*, in loving my enemies. By the phrase "as myself" it cautions me, however, that in the cases where I am "getting" something, my love may not be as "natural" as I think.

Dominion over the natural order and the power to create a history for themselves was granted Adam and Eve, but two trees were forbidden them, the Tree of Life and the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. (Actually in the biblical story the Tree of

Life is prohibited only after the Fall.) The former is a symbol common to most pagan mythologies and its appearance in Genesis is perhaps a survival from a pagan stage. At any rate, it is the second tree which is the fatal temptation.

> And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food and that it was pleasant to the eyes and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat.

It is to be noted that the story does not say that as a natural fruit this tree looked any more tempting than other trees which were permitted. Were it naturally more desirable than others, then God Himself would be the tempter in forbidding it and at the same time creating a natural order with a bias towards disobedience; were it less desirable man would not have been the image of God, but an animal defended from sin by his nature, and the prohibition would have been unnecessary. What is asserted is that man's real temptation, to disobey in order to become wise, was neither hindered nor provoked by his physical nature.

If one feels that the tree of life has no business to be in the garden of Eden at all, it is because it is incompatible with the notion of God as the creator of man. Its proper place is in pagan cosmologies, where the difference between gods and men is that the former are by fate permitted to eat of the tree of life, and the latter are not. If the gods were to be prevented from eating it, they would become mortal men and die; *vice versa*, if a man could succeed in eating it he would become an immortal god. To wish to eat of the tree of life, therefore, means to wish to become a god along with the other gods, to be related to them as equal to equal, instead of as slave to master. The master may, out of snobbery and jealousy for his superior position, try to prevent the slave from eating of the tree, but if the latter once succeeds in outwitting him there is nothing the former can do about it but accept the new relationship with a good grace.

If God is the creator of all things out of nothing, then the Tree of Life has no *raison d'être*. God does not need it to be God, for He made it, and, forbidden or not, it is impossible for man to eat of it, since a creature cannot become his Creator.

To wish, as Adam and Eve did, to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, on the other hand, is not a desire for equality or even superiority, but for autonomy. It is a desire to become one's own source of value, to become *as* God while still remaining a man, so that whether God exists or not is unimportant, since now any relationship to Him is unnecessary.

The one thing forbidden man, but which he insisted upon trying to take, was the right to love or not love as he chose. The immediate consequence of his disobedience was not suffering or any imposed punishment—these were to come later—but unhappiness; the relationship of Adam and Eve to God and to each other was not severed, but instantaneously altered from one of love and trust to one of guilt and anxiety.

> And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons;
> And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God.
> And the man said: The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.
> And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.

The sufferings which God predicts will follow are not so much imposed by Him from without, but are self-provoked consequences of man's unhappiness. God does not destroy man or take from him the powers with which He created him. The relation between man and nature may have become one of conflict instead of harmony, but man retains his dominion over the latter. Even as a sinner man is to be personally related to others, to make his history and create his culture. Further, the natural order, including the natural element in man, is to remain what it was in spite of sin. Whether we take the story of God's covenant with Noah in the ninth chapter of Genesis literally as a historic decision by God or figuratively as a historic human insight into God's nature, the meaning is the same—namely, that it is God's will that natural events should occur not arbitrarily but according to intelligible laws. The sun is to shine equally on the just and the unjust, and natural accidents like the fall of the tower at the pool of Siloam are not to be taken as divine moral judgments.

One consequence of the Fall was natural religion—*i.e.*, man's own efforts to escape from the state of anxiety into which the Fall had plunged him. Such efforts were bound to be self-frustrated, since they were rooted in a self-contradictory desire to find an Absolute which at the same time should be controllable by man—a desire, in fact, to find the tree of life and eat of it.

Natural religions are of two kinds, polytheistic-magical and monistic-rational. Contradictory as they are in many respects, they have two features in common: to neither is God the creator of the world and to both happiness is identical with pleasure.

In the polytheistic cosmology, nature is the common origin of both gods and men.

> There is one
> race of men, one race of gods; both have breath
> of life from a single mother. But sundered power
> holds us divided, so that the one is nothing, while for the other
> the brazen sky is established
> their sure citadel forever. Yet we have some likeness in great
> intelligence or strength to the immortals,
> though we know not what the day will bring, what comes after nightfall
> destiny has written that we must run to the end.
>
> (Pindar, *Nemean* ix.)

The existence of nature is necessary to the gods, as they need it for their playground, but their existence is not necessary to nature. Men are similar in essence to the gods, only subject to the time and death. There seems no reason why the gods should be concerned

with human affairs, but the uncertainties of human life, its unpredictable and inexplicable triumphs and disasters, seem a proof that they do. Human suffering—*i.e.*, the frustration of his desires—seems the result of the withdrawal of the gods' concern or their active antagonism, human pleasure or happiness the result of their favour. The task of human religion is to persuade them to take a favourable interest and dissuade them from hostility, so that man may prosper in his undertakings. If the only alternative man can see is between being destroyed by their disfavour and enduring a certain degree of suffering, he will accept the latter, but in his heart only as a temporary measure. The ultimate goal of religion is the discovery of the infallible magic which will compel the gods to help man to succeed without his having to sacrifice anything in return.

In the monistic cosmology nature is coeternal with God, from whom she derives not her existence but such order as she possesses. The existence of God therefore is necessary to nature, for without him she would be a chaotic welter of meaningless events, but the existence of nature is neither necessary nor of concern to God, who is the perfectly self-sufficient being. Man is capable of getting to know God through the exercise of the divine element in him, his reason. Till he does he is doomed to suffer, because suffering is the product of his incarceration in matter and time. Once he has, he will be immune from suffering. While the polytheistic gods were happy because they and only they could enjoy any particular pleasure they desired when they wanted it, the philosophical God has only one pleasure, the true pleasure of contemplation which is to be called happiness, compared with which all other pleasures are lower or unreal.

The task of human religion is the ascent from ignorance to knowledge of the truth which once known will be as binding on the will as the truths of mathematics.

The polytheistic priest could keep his magic secret from the unqualified masses; the philosopher, on the other hand, is first of all the teacher who shows others at a lower stage the way to the truth, and secondly, to the degree that they cannot or will not learn, the ruler who lays down the principles for every kind of human activity.

In neither kind of natural religion, therefore, is there a conception of the laity and the priesthood as two orders with distinct functions and equal importance. To the polytheistic religion, the priest is a specialised layman whose choice of profession is derived from his natural skill in magic or his inherited membership in a priestly caste, to be consulted by others when and only when they are in need of his special services—*i.e.*, when they wish to be successful in some enterprise, like war or love. In the monistic religion the philosopher is the only complete man; if he be thought of as a priest and the uninstructed as the laity, then ideally there should be no laity and in practice the laity are to be ruled by the priest.

Beside and in contradistinction to the development of Natural Religion, there is discernible in history, or so Christians believe,

another factor, the Religion of Revelation—*i.e.*, God's movement to redeem the fallen world by revealing His nature to man. This may be called a consequence of the Fall in the sense that had the latter not occurred man would never have lost his vision of the true God, but not in the sense that it was inevitable as natural religion was; the revelation was the free work of God's mercy and love.

A religion of revelation is inseparably bound up with the notion of vocation or calling. While in a natural religion the presence of God is identified with the experience of a sudden access in power or a sudden lucidity of understanding, in a revealed religion it is experienced as a voice which issues a command, "Go get thee up." "Follow me." A command is addressed not to the emotions nor to the understanding, but to the will, and it implies that the person addressed is capable of obedience or disobedience; one does not issue commands to a thing.

The history of Revelation is divided into parts, the history of a nation, the Jews, as set forth in the Old Testament and the history of a person, our Lord, as set forth in the New. Similarly the conception of divine calling is twofold; there is the calling of the Jewish people by God and the calling of the twelve Apostles by Christ. The relation in fact between the Jewish nation and the Gentiles before the Incarnation is analogous to the relation between the priesthood and the laity after it.

The calling of the Jews and the calling of the Apostles are similar in this respect, that if one asks the question, Why did Jehovah call the Jews rather than any other nation? or, Why did Christ call the Apostles He did call rather than any other individuals He encountered during His ministry? one can give no answer.

In neither case can it be said that those chosen posssesed natural endowments which made them exceptional, nor that they were more or less sinful than others; it cannot even be said that God loved them more; it can only be said that He chose them for an exceptional task.

The Jews were called collectively to experience a peculiar revelation of God through their history; they were not to teach or preach, they were not to speculate about the universe or observe the history of others, but to be exclusively absorbed in reflection upon what happened to themselves.

While God permitted—would it be too much to say that He willed?—the Gentiles to use their natural gifts of imagination and reason and power which came from Him to explore to the limit the possibilities of natural religion, so that it should be impossible later to say that Human Culture, the attempt to establish happiness and goodness on earth through art or philosophy or politics, had not failed, but had merely not been carried far enough, He reserved to the Jews His revelation of Himself as the Creator of the world and the Lord of history, so that when in the fullness of time the Word should be made flesh, and be slain for the redemption of man, it should be an act possible both to believe and to believe without misunderstanding.

It was to the Jews that God revealed that in relation to Him man is a free son, not a slave, and that though he must obey God, because in obedience lies his own happiness, yet with both his reason and his emotions he may argue with and protest against God's commands. Even in the presence of his master he is to be honest.

It was to the Jews also that God revealed the essential difference between happiness and pleasure, despair and pain. Happiness consists in a loving and trusting relation to God; accordingly we are to take one thing and one thing only seriously, our eternal duty to be happy, and to that all considerations of pleasure and pain are subordinate. Thou shalt love God and thy neighbour and Thou shalt be happy mean the same thing.

Pleasure and suffering are given states of feeling which have no significance except in relation to happiness. As a consequence of man's fall, the pleasure he finds in loving himself frequently conflicts with the duty to love in which lies his happiness, so that doing his duty involves accepting suffering. On the other hand, suffering and failure are not to be taken in themselves as proofs of punishment for sin; they may equally well be tests of faith. We must accept suffering if and when it comes, not because suffering is a morally superior condition we can pretend that we desire, nor that any pleasure is an illusion we can pretend to despise, but because our duty to be happy is the only matter we have to consider.

(*To be concluded*)

W. H. Auden.

## American Letter: No. 8

When the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States attempts to influence social conditions, it suffers from two disadvantages. First, its structure and traditions suggest that it is, like the Church of England, a national church, which is supposed to represent officially the spiritual outreach of the body politic. As a matter of fact it does not hold such a position in any way at all. Secondly, it is a relatively small communion, in terms of the total population of the United States, and one that happens to derive its greatest strength from the privileged social classes of the eastern states, because of a variety of reasons.

In the light of the two disadvantages, it is surprising that the Protestant Episcopal Church is able to exert much influence at all. But, largely because its constituency has a much higher proportion of those who exercise leadership in civil life than do other communions, and also because in a symbolic way it often acts as the focal point, or orienting centre, for the non-Roman Christian community, the fact is that it exercises an influence out of all proportion to its size and position. The Protestant Episcopal Church has much more weight in American social life than would be expected from a communion of approximately 2,000,000 communicants in a population of 150 millions.

The picture is further complicated by the fact that the voice of

the Episcopal Church on social questions does not really represent the thinking of its members. While this is generally true of all religious groups in America, the difference between the opinions of that leadership making its voice heard, and what most of the constituency takes for granted, is more particularly marked in the Episcopal Church than in any other communion, except possibly the two larger Presbyterian Churches. When the Bishop of Missouri, Dr William Scarlett, who is the chairman of the Commission on the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, speaks on public questions, his voice is one to be reckoned with in public life. But it neither represents the communicants of the Diocese of Missouri, nor does it influence their political and economic thought and action to any real degree.

There is a sharp division between the genuine concern for social progress, greater social security, the protection and advancement of civil rights, and the movement for greater racial equality which is expressed by a significant, and certainly the most outspoken, element of the leadership of the Episcopal Church and what the rank and file think and do. (The Presiding Bishop, Dr Henry Knox Sherrill, served as a member of the President's Commission on Civil Rights, which drew up a bill of particulars some three or four years ago, yet the laity of the Diocese of South Carolina have yet to admit the Negro priests of their own diocese to membership in the diocesan convention.)

The more outspoken leaders of the Episcopal Church tend to support the Democratic Party in matters of national politics and to lean towards the Fair Deal element within it. For many of them the 1948 presidential election was a choice between Mr Truman and Mr Henry A. Wallace, with Mr Norman Thomas, the Socialist candidate, offering the opportunity for a protest vote. The more prominent lay members of the Church supported Mr Dewey in that election, and are steadfast Republicans if they live in the north, and anti-Fair Deal Democrats if they live in the south, and lend their weight to such conservative political and economic groups as the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the National Association of Manufacturers.

While there is a real difference between the way such outspoken national leaders as the Bishop of Washington, Dr Angus Dun, the Bishop of Michigan, Dr Richard S. M. Emrich, the Bishop of Massachusetts, Dr Norman Nash, Bishop Scarlett and others view social problems, and the way the communicant members view the same problems by and large, still both are in the same Church. Yet more often than not the outspoken leadership and the lay communicants are out of contact with one another in these areas, and neither pays the other as much attention as it might. Nevertheless, they can meet and work together on specifically church questions, and this lends an air of reality to what is done on social problems.

In many annual diocesan conventions, the diocesan Commission on Christian Social Relations brings in a list of resolutions on social

questions—fair employment practices, public housing, displaced persons, etc.—and usually these are approved by substantial majorities. The significance of such action is hard to appraise. It certainly has little effect on state and national legislation, but a good many clergymen who are interested in political and economic action feel that resolutions passed by conventions give them warrant to speak without fear of criticism. Some of the members of the same conventions which pass the resolutions, however, may also be distributing copies of John T. Flynn's diatribe, *The Road Ahead*, which has a chapter purporting to show that interest in social matters by church leaders is a step toward Communism.

An indication of the gap between even official church action on social questions and the way the membership thinks and acts is the work of the Commission on Social Reconstruction of the General Convention of which Bishop Scarlett is the chairman. This Commission was appointed at the 1937 General Convention for the original purpose of keeping in touch with the social thinking of the late Archbishop Temple and relating it to the American scene, but the group from the outset took a more independent line. In its first report, to the 1943 General Convention, it referred in generalities to the need for its own work and asked to be continued. The Convention approved ths, but it rejected and even refused to have printed among its miscellaneous reports an appended report from a sub-committee of theologians under the chairmanship of Dr Clifford L. Stanley. The theological report was much more specific.

As a report to the 1947 General Convention, the Commission brought out a book, paid for by private subscription and by public sale so as to be independent of restrictive action by the Convention. The book, *Christianity Looks Ahead*, was published in a thirty-five cent, paper-bound edition for popular sale. It was read widely, but its influence is hard to measure, because it was composed of brief essays of a very general nature written by very prominent people such as Mrs Franklin D. Roosevelt, former Secretary of State Sumner Welles, etc. An attempt to have the General Convention officially disavow sponsorship for the book was defeated.

In 1950 the Commission brought out another book, this time as a result of three small regional conferences where papers were presented on assigned subjects. Selections were made from them for another thirty-five cent volume. This book, *The Christian Approach to Social Justice*, was a much more serious attempt to come to grips specifically, and from a serious theological point of view, with the problems of the present day. Its contributors included Canon Theodore O. Wedel of the Washington Cathedral, Mr Paul Hoffman, chairman of the European Recovery Program, Mr Victor Reuther of the United Automobile Workers, and (with apologies) the writer of this article. While the second book was a much more direct attempt to relate the Church to the questions of the day, its sale has been very poor. It has not been pushed within the Church itself, and the general public has never been informed.

A further example of the hiatus between the thinking of the

Church on social questions on the part of its leaders and the way the rank and file react may be evidenced by the recent actions of the Convention of the Diocese of Texas. On several occasions the lay members of this convention have refused to pass a resolution committing the diocese to a policy of racial equality, even though the Bishop-coadjutor, Dr John E. Hines, has himself taken the floor to push the measure.

Within the Episcopal Church there is the unofficial Episcopal League for Social Action (formerly the Church League for Industrial Democracy), which in some ways parallels the Industrial Christian Fellowship, although without nearly as large a membership nor as great influence. The League attempts to educate the Church on social questions and to throw its weight to the progressive side of social issues. For a long time its former secretary, the Rev. William B. Spofford, who retired two years ago, was the stormy petrel of the American Church. He was found in the thick of every controversy. But the ELSA, and its predecessor the CLID, must be regarded as primarily a clergy movement, with a few interested laymen, and a fair number of socially minded, elderly women who contribute generously to its budget and approve social resolutions, even though they can do little in the way of action.

The ELSA is facing the same difficult problem in its effect upon the membership of the Episcopal Church that similar groups in the other Protestant communions in America are having to deal with. The problem has two sides—what the group itself does, and what the public thinks it is. On the first side, the liberal group within the Episcopal Church has been split since the days of the "phonev" war, as I reported in THEOLOGY last year (October, 1949), and Mr Spofford has appeared to be the spokesman of the Soviet "line" on every question. The result has been that the ELSA, as such, has done nothing at all, because no consensus was possible without coming to terms with the Russian question. On the other side, the Church, to the extent that it has been aware of the ELSA at all, has identified it with Mr Spofford's views and dismissed it as either dangerous or irrelevant. The appointment of a new secretary, the Rev. Andrew VanDyke, may result in some changes. A meeting is to be held this fall to see whether the liberal movements within the Church can work more effectively in the Church's life.

Another angle of the Episcopal Church's effect on social thinking involves the concrete results of the kind of welfare or settlement-house work which has been done in its name by its members. This activity was discussed last year in some detail. It may be important to mention here, however, that the effect upon those who have received help has not been generally in the direction of inculcating within them any form of Christian social conscience. While a great deal of economic, sociological, health and recreational work has been done among people who needed it, both in the urban slums and in the southern mountains, more often than not the beneficiaries try to attain a typical American middle-class social position for themselves, and when they do they find themselves cut off from the type

of Episcopalianism they knew in the settlements, and not really at home in the type of Episcopalianism they find in the suburbs. Therefore, they very often become members of typical lower middle-class Protestant Churches, as if their training in Anglican liturgy and symbol had little apparent meaning for them.

When all this has been put together, it follows that the influence of the Episcopal Church in the field of social action, progressive legislation, and general public opinion, actually counts for more when it is associated with the rest of the non-Roman world in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. While the Federal Council itself demonstrates the same problem of cleavage between membership of the member churches and the position of its leaders, nevertheless, it does succeed in presenting a "front" which must be taken seriously because of the people who are enlisted in its service.

The Episcopal Church is providing its full share and more of the leadership of the Federal Council on social questions. Bishop Scarlett is chairman of the Commission on the Approaches to a Just and Durable Peace. Bishop Dun is chairman of the Commission on Human Rights and the Atomic Bomb, which includes among its nineteen members three other Episcopalians, Professor Albert T. Mollegen of the Virginia Theological Seminary, Professor George Thomas of Princeton, and Professor Theodore M. Green of Yale. A number of other Episcopalians, such as Dean Sidney E. Sweet of St Louis, have taken the leadership in regional conferences on Management and labour. Bishop Emrich of Michigan was chairman of a major venture in this field last winter.

All this adds up to the realization that the Episcopal Church is involved in the same discouraging picture as the whole of American Christendom, even when allowances are made for the fact that the American form of Anglicanism evinces capacities for social leadership out of all proportion to the relative size of its membership. When the social classification of its members is taken into account, the result is a peculiar sense of pride that as much happens in the field of social action as actually does. While it cannot be said that the Protestant Episcopal Church in any serious way is remaking America, its possible contribution to such a remaking cannot be dismissed in advance.

CHARLES D. KEAN.

---

## OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. A. G. Hebert is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham.

Mr W. H. Auden, the well-known poet, is Associate Professor of English Literature at Ann Arbor University, Michigan.

Dr Kean is Rector of Grace Episcopal Church, Kirkwood, Missouri.

# CORRESPONDENCE

## THE MOTHER OF GOD

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I had hoped that previous correspondence would have been accepted as a sufficient debate on this subject, and I fear that your readers will be growing weary of it. As, however, the fundamental theological question has been raised again by Dr Mascall, I must ask leave to make a brief reply. In expounding our relationship to Mary, Dr Mascall argues that if Mary was the mother of Christ, then (by our incorporation into Him) she is our mother *now*, with an "ontological (not merely fictitious or honorific) motherhood" (*Mother of God*, p. 42). The surface logic is flawless, and exactly parallel to the more familiar argument that if God is the Father of Christ, then (by the same incorporation into Him) God is our Father *now*. The very force of the parallelism ought to make us uneasy: where exactly is it taking us? (The fact that an argument is logically unassailable is no guarantee of its theological soundness, as many a heretic has discovered.) When, combined with this insistence on an ontological relation to Mary as our mother, we find also an undue separation and exaltation of Mary far above the other saints (this is commonly taught as the central significance of the Assumption of her who was Immaculately Conceived); and when she is made—next to our Lord —the chief focus of prayer and devotion, we are more uneasy still. For, whatever the formal theological safeguards against this, the cult implies and suggests that Mary is more than an ordinary human being; and the permanent natural temptation of piety to treat her as a divine-human goddess has no proper check. Most of the contributors to *The Mother of God* use the hand grenade of "docetism" in making war upon those who disagree with their claims for Mary: we may yet have to lob it back into their trenches. The high "Catholic" cultus, however formally orthodox, may yet prove to have introduced a docetism of our Lady. Mary is and remains a created human being, one of us before God. And her *historical* role of clothing the Logos with flesh, and of bringing Him up in all the real growth that He had, this *historical* motherhood is over: *Mater emerita*; it is a function performed whose results abide. To honour her for it is most scriptural. But to describe our present relationship to her in terms of "ontological motherhood" is neither scriptural nor expedient. Our real relationship to Mary now is of the same kind as our real relationship to the rest of the glorious saints who stand before the Lamb. In substituting for this picture in the Apocalypse a new picture in which Mary is separated from the other saints, and (as our crowned mother) is the object of fervent adoration and supplication, medieval and Eastern Catholics have disturbed the proportion of faith. If Anglicans who seek a reformed Catholicism cannot stomach this kind of thing, and the cultus that goes with it, that is not because we are secret monophysites, as Dr

Mascall suggests, but because we would acknowledge implicitly as well as explicitly only one Mediator. And we wish to honour His mother as we feel she herself would have us honour her: as one of ourselves, justified only by her Son, and taking her glorious place among the other saints about His throne, in the one fellowship of prayer and praise.

Yours faithfully,
BASIL S. MOSS.

LINCOLN THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE.

[This correspondence is now closed.—ED.]

## BAPTISM AND CIRCUMCISION

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I do not find it easy to follow the line of Mr Fenton's argument. In his first sentence he appears to grant everything for which I was contending. But he then proceeds to urge that the New Testament does after all support the substitution of infant baptism for circumcision.

His main point concerns the meaning of Col. ii, which I still hold to be the only New Testament passage where circumcision and baptism are mentioned together. My contention is that Paul is not here comparing Jewish circumcision with baptism, but with that spiritual circumcision of the heart which in his teaching was the necessary prerequisite of baptism. Lightfoot summarizes the argument thus (Comm. on Col. *ad loc.*): "You do not need the circumcision of the flesh; for you have received the circumcision of the heart. The distinguishing features of this higher circumcision are threefold: (1) It is not external but inward, not made with hands but wrought by the Spirit. (2) It divests not of a part only of the flesh, but of the whole body of carnal affections. (3) It is the circumcision not of Moses or of the patriarchs, but of Christ." This circumcision of the heart clearly cannot be identified with the baptism of believers, still less with infant baptism.

Commenting on verse 11 in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*, Professor A. S. Peake—also not a Baptist scholar—says that the Christian circumcision "was their conversion, the inward circumcision of the heart, by which they entered on the blessings of the New Covenant. The outward sign of this is baptism, with which Paul connects it in the next verse. But it cannot be identified with it, for it is not made with hands."

When Paul speaks in Gal. iii 27 f. of the distinction between Jew and Greek having been overcome in Christ, there is no hint that he has circumcision in mind. "In Christ" all distinctions of race, status, or sex are as nothing. So far as Jew and Greek are concerned he is no doubt thinking, as in much of his writing, of the previous religious privileges of the Jew, and perhaps also of the barrier of mutual contempt which Christ has cast down. But there is nothing to suggest circumcision.

I am afraid I am unrepentant and see no reason to withdraw or even to modify any of my statements. There may be good arguments for infant baptism, but circumcision is not one of them.

Yours faithfully,
HUGH MARTIN.

---

# BOOK REVIEWS

THE PERSON AND WORK OF CHRIST. By B. B. Warfield. Edited by Samuel G. Craig. The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. $4.50.

In this bulky volume of 575 pages there have been collected essays produced on various occasions by Professor Warfield over a period of several years. The earliest was, in fact, written in 1902 and the latest in 1918. Three sermons have been added to the fourteen articles in order to round off this volume of what, so we are promised, will be a considerable series of Warfield's writings.

In their own day these articles must evidently have presented a forceful and scholarly statement of classical Protestant orthodoxy on the doctrine of the Person of Christ and the Atonement; their republication at least serves to remind us of the change which has come over the climate of theology in the course of thirty or forty years. The situation which Warfield had in mind when he wrote these articles may be summed up in his statement that "the characterizing feature of recent theories of the person of Christ is that they are all humanitarian. The Kenotic theory, which tried to find a middle ground between the God-man and the merely-man Jesus, having passed out of sight, the field is held by pure humanitarianism." A later article shows the impact of Schweitzer upon this humanitarianism: "The naturalistic criticism of a hundred and fifty years has run out into no Jesus at all, or worse than no Jesus, a fanatic or even a paranoiac." In opposition to the humanism of the early twentieth century, Dr Warfield strives to maintain the truth of the Chalcedonian definition as "a careful statement in systematic form of the pure teaching of the Scriptures", and in defending Scriptural and credal orthodoxy he delivers weighty blows against Drews and other representatives of "liberal" extremism.

His arguments are generally sound and they are supported by a powerful weight of scholarship; but the modern study of the Gospels has inevitably caused some of them to appear badly "dated" to the present-day reader. Thus from the standpoint of the modern understanding of the New Testament Dr Warfield underestimates the theological character of St. Mark; in matters of detail his comments on such questions as the meaning of *ἀγαπάω* (p. 105) are now, in view of recent lexical study, outmoded.

It is unfortunate that he never really faces the problems raised by critical study of the Gospels. His dating of the Synoptic Gospels is distinctly odd; Luke is regarded as certainly prior to Mark and

Matthew as at least contemporary with Mark and perhaps as old as Luke. The discourses of the Fourth Gospel are treated as being on an equal footing with the Synoptists as an historical source. At times, too, his argument is scarcely fair; thus the reading "the only-begotten God" is adopted in John i, 18 with no indication of any variant, and his treatment of "God over all" in Rom. ix, 5 is distinctly misleading (pp. 219 ff.). His "Fundamentalist" treatment of the Old Testament, with its tiresome denigration of the followers of Wellhausen as "theorists" or "theorizers" (p. 408), contrasts strangely with the scholarly handling of the New Testament vocabulary of "redemption" a few pages later.

The second part of the book is chiefly occupied with a vigorous apologia for substitutionary and sacrificial views of the Atonement against the liberal moralism of the author's own day—an apologia whose somewhat narrow and extreme character brings its writer into sharp conflict with a greater theologian who should have proved an ally in his fight against humanism, P. T. Forsyth.

There is much of value in this book, and more that would become of historical interest if it formed part of a general study of the theology of the early twentieth century; but one is bound to wonder whether a mere collection and reprint of Warfield's work in the totally different atmosphere of modern theology can really prove to be, as the publishers so optimistically claim, a "timely book of lasting value."

St John's College, Oxford. G. W. H. Lampe.

---

St Ambrose on the Sacraments and on the Mysteries. Translated by T. Thompson. Edited with Introduction and Notes by J. H. Srawley. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

This is a new edition of a book which first appeared in 1919. The translation remains unchanged with a few alterations; but the Introduction and Notes are rewritten in view of the belief, now widely held, that the *De Sacramentis* is the work of St Ambrose as well as the *De Mysteriis*. (It is interesting to note that the Vienna *Corpus* will contain a volume in which the Ambrosian authorship of the *De Sacramentis* will be maintained.) Dr Srawley sets out the arguments, with admirable clearness, for this belief.

The appearance of this book comes opportunely at a time when the subject of Holy Baptism is so much discussed. The simpler, conversational style of the *De Sacramentis* as compared with the *De Mysteriis* is a point which will interest those who are contending for an alternative, simpler form of Holy Baptism to-day. Again, the light thrown upon the Milanese use by these treatises indicates a variety, even in the fourth century, both in rite and in doctrine, which is welcome to those who, like the reviewer, are somewhat suspicious of an attempt to treat any variation in early Christian initiation as Procrustes dealt with those whom he placed upon his bed. It is not quite clear, for example, to which part of the rite, according to Ambrose, "regeneration" is to be assigned. Dr Srawley

thinks it is baptism followed by unction. But the texts Ambrose goes on to mention would suggest that it was baptism alone. Again, Dr Srawley points out that the relation of the post-baptismal unction to the giving of the "spiritual seal" has led to much discussion, and that in the *De Sacramentis* "the two are plainly distinct". Indeed, it is not at all clear what constitutes "the spiritual seal"; but it may be the signing with the cross. Or again, to mention a doctrinal point, for Ambrose Baptism washed away actual, personal sin, but not "original" sin, which was removed by the Milanese rite of feet-washing. In view of these and other variations, we are grateful to note that Dr Srawley never speaks, as many modern writers do, of the "pattern" of Christian initiation.

It seems doubtful to the reviewer if Ambrose bases his discussion on "daily bread" (p. 104) or on the elements in prayer (p. 117) on Origen's *De Oratione*, whose treatment is really very different. He never refers to the Eucharist in this connexion; but this is uppermost in Ambrose's mind. It seems strange that Ambrose would not, from motives of secrecy, speak of the Lord's Prayer in a work for publication (p. 17), seeing that in the third century three treatises in connexion with the Prayer were published. Again (pp. 40, 41), it seems an over-simplification to contrast Ambrose and Augustine as illustrating the "realistic" and "spiritualizing" views of the Eucharist, respectively; for Augustine was in fact appealed to in later history by persons of very different schools of thought as supporting their tenets.

J. E. L. Oulton.

Trinity College,
Dublin.

---

Introduction to St Augustine: The City of God, being selections from the *De Civitate Dei* with text, translation and running commentary. By R. H. Barrow. Faber and Faber. 30s.

Mr Barrow belongs to the increasing number of classical scholars who desire to see bridged the gulf which since the Enlightenment has been fixed between classical and Christian studies. The *De Civitate Dei* offers eminently suitable material for this purpose, but its length and discursiveness are apt to deter modern readers. Selection therefore is necessary, at all events by way of introduction. But selection is difficult when, as in this case, there is a superabundance of important and famous passages from which to choose. Mr Barrow takes as his guide St Augustine's own declared theme—the Origins, Courses and Ends of the Heavenly and Earthly Cities—which begins to be prominent from Book XI onwards. Most of his selections, which in all amount to some one-tenth of the whole work, come therefore from its second part, its major and substantive part. The first ten books, which are apologetic and *ad hoc*, are in the main disregarded. But the latter part of Book V, which deals with the place of the Roman Empire in the purpose and providence of God, is usefully employed to strengthen the section on world history, admittedly the weakest part of the *De Civitate Dei*. And the twenty-

first chapter of Book II is brought into connexion with XIX, 21, where its subject receives fuller consideration. Practically the whole of Book XIX is included, which is obviously right; but one may ask whether there should not have been something from the later books to show how St Augustine's teleology is set in an eschatological framework of Judgment to come, and the separation of the good to blessedness and the evil to damnation.

The text is accompanied by an excellent translation, just free enough to bring out the sense and to be easily readable. But it was surely un-Augustinian to translate *sapiens* by "pagan saint" instead of by "sage" (p. 70). Prefixed to the translation are careful lexicographical notes on the words Civitas Societas Finis Justitia, which are, of course, of quite fundamental importance and are not readily to be translated.

The commentary which follows is exactly what a commentary should be—an explanation of the thought of the author in its sequence, in its connexion with past classical thought, and in its relevance to the philosophical and ethical questions of to-day. It has to be read with the selections before one's eyes or at least clearly in one's mind, and it keeps fairly close to them, which allows Mr Barrow to avoid some difficult questions. Nevertheless if he follows the exegesis with the requisite care the student will find a closely reasoned account of the essentials of St Augustine's philosophy in relation to other philosophies ancient and modern. No better exposition of the Augustinian Ethic as contrasted with classical ethics could be had than is contained in the commentary on Book XIX; and one cannot refrain from mentioning the illuminating treatment of the famous "Mirror of Princes".

University of Edinburgh. John H. S. Burleigh.

---

Frederick Denison Maurice. By H. G. Wood. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.

Dr Wood's book is of interest and value for its own sake, and is quite different in character from Florence Higham's vivid little sketch of the same title (S.C.M. Press, 1947). Just over a hundred years after the publication of "Letters to a Member of the Society of Friends by A Clergyman of the Church of England"—the original title and form of Maurice's *Kingdom of Christ*—this leading Quaker scholar chose "the place of Maurice in the religious thought of the Victorian era" for his Dale lectures at Mansfield College, Oxford, in 1942-3. This book, based on those lectures, now appears two years after the publication of Dr Vidler's 1947 Hale Lectures and loses much of its interest by the delay in printing. Dr Wood joins the chorus of those who now confidently affirm that "Maurice's legacy has not yet been fully appropriated . . . his principles are peculiarly relevant to our own age." Those principles are not as fully worked out as in Dr Vidler's *Theology of F. D. Maurice*, nor is there as much quotation, but Dr Wood's book makes clearer some of the ways in which Maurice himself gives practical expression to his

principles. In fact, this book is stronger on Maurice as prophet and teacher than as "digger", though all is shown to flow from his theology. Rare justice is done to Maurice as educator, and his basic political views are handled with fuller seriousness than has been usual in books which dealt with him primarily as the prophet of Christian Socialism: his critique of democracy was usually overlooked.

There is a good chapter on Maurice's critique of Newman's "Essay on Development", but the best thing in the book is the all too brief chapter on *The Kingdom of Christ*. What Dr Wood has to say about Maurice's view of Quakerism is naturally of interest: "I think Maurice failed to appreciate something very vital in primitive Quakerism. He has no adequate understanding of worship after the manner of Friends, the discovery of silence as the way of wonder, and the recovery of the spontaneous prophetic ministry. But Maurice saw clearly many elements of strength and weakness in Quakerism and in some respects he understood the Friends better than they understood or understand themselves. . . . His detailed observations show a real acquaintance with the state of the Society in his day, and they are not irrelevant to the Society of to-day."

Above all Dr Wood recognizes very clearly the importance of Maurice for the Ecumenical Movement, and incidentally gives an impressive list of Free Church divines who have acknowledged his influence upon them. Maurice learnt early the principle of polarity of truth, from Plato, probably not from Charles Simeon's, "the truth is not in the middle and not in one extreme, but in both extremes". "But", continues Wood, "Maurice certainly agreed with Simeon in rejecting the Englishman's tendency to compromise. . . . He was anxious to do justice to both extremes, to combine the advantages of both, as the result of insight. He abhors eclecticism, though he may not always succeed in avoiding it. But armed with this discovery of the polarity of truth, he examined the divisions of the Christian Church, expecting to find that men are more normally right in what they affirm and wrong in what they deny. Obviously things will not work out quite as simply as that, but Maurice was most concerned to expose the errors of those who find the truth in only one extreme and who proceed to erect systems and organize churches on their limited discovery. . . . A true Catholicity was only to be achieved by finding the truth in extremes. The œcumenical movement can proceed only on this assumption and by this method."

It is not reasonable to expect more than brief mention of Maurice's position in the Church of England in lectures to congregationalist theological students. Dr Wood does, however, say, surely with truth, "Maurice perhaps more than any other of his contemporaries might legitimately be described as Anglo-Catholic, and the paradox of such a description would to his mind have been but one more example of the polarity of truth. He believed in the Church of England because it was national and comprehensive as no sect could be. He believed in the Church of England, because it seemed to him to present the claims of the church universal effectively to the

English people, and to enable the English people to take their rightful place in the church universal." Dr Wood does far less than justice to "the signs of the Kingdom of Christ". Strangely enough, he emphasizes the place of liturgy more than of creeds. "Maurice valued the liturgical forms precisely because they were not modern, because the Book of Common Prayer is a book in which we join in prayers that unite us with praying souls of every Christian generation. Maurice was not forcing his thought into alien forms. He loved the liturgy. His volume of sermons on the Prayer Book and the Lord's Prayer and the little book, *The Church a Family*, should stand beside Hooker, Book V." While of the creeds he says little more than, "Explain it how we will, Maurice sincerely accepted the creeds". This is a powerful understatement! Indeed, my feeling is that the weakness of this book lies in the fact that, while explaining to some extent the rooted distinction between a true and false dogmatism in what has been called Maurice's "system-phobia", it does scant justice to Maurice the dogmatist. Maurice is, indeed, no systematizer, but the creed and the order of affirmation in the creed is basic to his seminal mind. It is also a pity that a study of "the place of Maurice in religious thought" should so completely ignore his *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, on which he worked for almost the whole of his life. Dr Wood is by no means the first writer on Maurice to be guilty of this oversight. Yet Hort once said, " 'The Kingdom of Christ' and his 'Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy' are Maurice's two greatest works: all else is a kind of commentary on these".

W. Merlin Davies.

Stafford.

---

Ämbetet i den Svenska Kyrkan. By Ragnar Askmark. Gleerup, Lund, 12.50 kronor.

The author of this book on "The Ministry in the Swedish Church" has imposed on himself grave limitations of scope. He limits himself to one only of the streams into which Western Christendom became divided after the cataclysm of the Reformation: to that country which more than any other country in Europe excluded from itself non-Lutheran influences: and to the period in which it was most isolated, the two hundred years from the period of the Reformation to that of Lutheran Orthodoxy and Pietism, before the time when new problems were raised, first by the Enlightenment and later by the high-church movement and the beginning of foreign missions. The book thus provides no standards of judgment beyond those of the Lutheran Reformation, and thereby can give no help towards the solution of the problems which the Reformation itself raised. Nor does the author make any effort to overcome these limitations; he sees, for instance, the Catholic priesthood wholly from the point of view of its rejection by the Reformers. Consequently this is a most un-ecumenical book, and one of the dullest ever.

On the Gospel of God, Luther had mighty things to say; but on the subject of the Ministry, little that was constructive beyond the duty of the Minister to proclaim the Word. "The general priesthood of all believers" was asserted by him and the Swedish Reformers after him, and there was need to assert it against the medieval domination of the Church by the clergy; but there is little sign in this book that much was done to implement it, or to treat the laity as more than passive church-attenders, or indeed that the Royal Priesthood of the Faithful became more than a stick to beat the Catholics with. Under Lutheran Orthdoxy we see a steady reassertion of clericalism. At this point this Lutheran book compares very unfavourably with the book by a Belgian Jesuit reviewed immediately below.

The Ministry in this book is viewed altogether as the Ministry of the Word, and all the emphasis is on the preaching-office rather than on its pastoral function (for the "power of the keys" is mainly limited to the exercise of discipline), or on the liturgical function of the Minister in the worshipping community. Hence a reviewer cannot but suspect that the author has done less than justice to so important a figure as Laurentius Petri, the first Lutheran Archbishop of Uppsala, who, as Archbishop Brilioth showed long ago (see *Eucharistic Faith and Practice*, pp. 249-53), had very positive ideas about the God-ward action in the Eucharist. This book cannot be taken with any confidence as expressing the teaching of the Swedish Church about the Ministry.

A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.

Kelham.

---

Le Sacerdoce Royale des Fidèles, dans la tradition ancienne et moderne. By Paul Dabin, S.J. L'Edition Universelle, Brussels; Desclée, De Brouwer, Paris.

This posthumous book (Père Dabin died in June 1949) is a sequel to an earlier big book on "The Royal Priesthood of the Faithful in Holy Scripture" (Bloud, Paris, 1941), a glowing eulogy of which by Père Yves Congar is printed in the Preface. Most of this book is made up of a series of citataions from more than 250 Western writers from Minucius Felix to the present Pope, then of over seventy from the East, from the earliest Greek Fathers till an Orthodox writer of the seventeenth century, and finally of a few notes from Western and Eastern liturgical sources. This is preceded by an Introduction of some fifty pages, which breathes the air of a strict Roman Catholic orthodoxy; the author discusses with some care what degree of authority this doctrine has, and whether it is a "doctrine", and *de fide*; and he shows no tenderness towards Anglicans or other Protestants, and rarely uses the word "Protestant" without bringing in the word "heresy". Yet the substance of the book is of much importance. If in this review I refrain from comments, it is not that I have no comments to make, but that the limited space may be better used.

Père Dabin sets out to present a "theology of the laity", a

*laicologie*, as it comes in Tradition (pp. 11-28). There, the Royal Priesthood of the Faithful has the unanimous consent of the Fathers, of the Theologians (thirteenth to eighteenth century), and of the faithful; so unanimous that it is rare for a Church writer of importance to be silent about it, except for some of the mystics (pp. 14, 20, 54). Behind Tradition stands Scripture, particularly Exod. xix, 6, 1 Pet. ii, 5, 9, Apoc. i, 6, v, 10. There is no disposition anywhere in the Tradition to confuse the R.P.F. with the powers and jurisdiction belonging to the ordained Ministry; and when Lutheran heresy made this confusion, even so Catholic controversialists did not in general fall to the temptation to deny the R.P.F. (pp. 34, 61).

The Royal Priesthood is described in Scripture as bestowed by Christ, and as exercised towards the Father (Apoc. i, 6); and the Fathers say again and again that as Christ is King, Priest and Prophet, so all Christians share this triple office, in his mystical Body, through the Spirit (pp. 30-3). It is bestowed on them both collectively (1 Pet.) and individually (Apoc.); thereby they are distinguished from the unbaptized (pp. 36-8). Is it a metaphorical term? Not completely so, in the sense in which the Gnostics called themselves priests, and Ulpian said the same of lawyers (p. 40); for as a member of Christ the Christian has a sacramental character, and in the Eucharist he offers and is himself offered. But the metaphorical use applies to the ascetic in his ministry of prayer. Was the term rightly used theocratically, of the hierarchical Church at strife with the Emperor (p. 42)? It could safely be used anagogically, of the relation of the Church to the heavenly Jerusalem (p. 43). These are among the points which come up when the matter is handled and expounded in the Tradition.

Père Dabin ventures on a definition, of which the substance is that the R.P.F. is a functional participation, both individual and collective, largely passive but also active, in the triple office of Christ as King, Priest and Prophet: entered on by baptismal incorporation into Christ: perfected in Confirmation and symbolized by the chrismation: identifiable with the sacramental character of the Christian: admitting him to perform various acts of worship and cult: creating for him various moral and religious obligations: all without prejudice to the special priesthood of the hierarchy within the Body.

Protestant heresy, he says, has tended not to the usurpation by the laity of the functions of the hierarchy, but to their suppression (compare the review of Askmark's book, above). The natural tendency of sinful man is not really to be jealous of the prerogatives of the priest, but rather to feel a repulsion, grounded on fear, from the obligation to holiness which they involve (p. 62). For the laity to-day, confronted with secularism, the realization of "that which makes the greatness of their Christian calling and which alone enables them fully to live the Christian life" (p. 60) is of supreme importance. There is less danger of their becoming too priestly and too little lay than that they should be profane, secular, unconsecrated (p. 63).

A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.

Kelham.

# SHORTER NOTICES

Is God Evident? By Gerald Heard. Faber and Faber. 12s. 6d.

The function of science is the search for the "laws" governing natural processes—laws once described by Whitehead as "rules of succession". In the physical sciences a very high degree of probability has been achieved in the formulation of such rules; in the biological sciences the probability has generally been much lower; in the human sciences it has been lower still. Nevertheless, what has struck people everywhere most forcibly has been the certainty of the conclusions of the physical sciences—a certainty which has enabled us to make electric light and power a common service, and atomic fission a horrible reality.

The success of the physical sciences has, in particular, dazzled thinkers. It has raised their standards of evidence so high that nobody now dares to commit himself to a sharply defined view of life but an odd Christian or Communist. It has led to a very wide acceptance, as axiomatic, of the idea of a mechanical natural order. Consequently those who are concerned with the assimilation of science with other types of thought are faced with certain important questions: in what sense is science tied to determinism? or incompatible with a belief in miracles? Do the "rules of succession" formulated in the social sciences necessarily exclude free will? Is a mechanical interpretation of the evolutionary process incompatible with a Divine plan? Mr Heard in this book is mainly concerned with the last two questions; his object is to show that "the world we live in, the life that flows in us, and the consciousness which we experience, all show signs that we are environed, vitalized and made aware by and for a purpose greater than ourselves, but one in which we can find interest, deliverance, delight and indeed consummation". The quotation illustrates clearly the quality of the book. Mr Heard attacks the assumption that science excludes a religious interpretation of life, by considering in turn the implications of modern cosmology, evolutionary biology, and psychology; but although he makes a number of good points, and quotes *Nature* frequently, his manner makes it difficult for the inexpert to know how far to rely on his interpretation. If he had selected a smaller number of questions and considered both their scientific and their religious interpretations in greater detail, the book would have been more useful to readers (say) of Theology. But his object is clearly not so much objective discussion as frank propaganda; and in that role the book may do some good service.

Exeter. K. G. Collier.

---

St Francis of Assisi. A Biography by Omer Englebert. Translated and edited by Edward Hutton. Burns Oates. 16s.

The course of Franciscan studies has shown a development not unlike that of New Testament studies in the past century. Two examples of this work are the work of F. C. Burkitt and Coulton's

essay in vol. ii of Jackson and Hake's *Beginnings of Christianity*. Since 1266, when the Chapter of Paris ordered all other lives of the saint to be destroyed, the life by St Bonaventure has been the "official" life. This was written with a particular object in view—that of preserving and unifying the Franciscan Order, for by the middle of the thirteenth century there were two different interpretations of the Franciscan ideal. This "life" is exact as far as it goes, but incomplete in that it does not make clear many of the Founder's intentions. The growth of the Order, and the increase of the number of priests within it, had made inevitable some departure from the poverty and simplicity of the early days at Rivo Torto. It is always doubtful how far the exact intentions of the founder of any society which has a long life on a large scale can be permanently put into effect. Even during the lifetime of St Francis it became evident that some departure from his own ideal was inevitable, and forty years after his death the main lines of the Order were established—it was to have a privileged place in the Church and to be the home of scholars. This explains why so much critical work has had to be done. It has been necessary to recover the primitive figure of St Francis, the Little Poor Man of Assisi who has generally been held to be the most Christ-like person since New Testament times. The Abbé Englebert, whose work now appears in a translation by Edward Hutton, has used the most recently discovered documents. This alone would justify the publication of yet another life of the saint. No major biography of St Francis has appeared in English since those of Joergensen and Father Cuthbert. Its particular merit is that it is well documented but not dull, and its copious quotations are so arranged as to allow the character and intentions of the saint to stand out clearly. The illustrations are well chosen.

WOOLAVINGTON. P. R. P. BARKER.

---

THE CHRISTIAN FACES THE RUINS. By M. Riquet, S.J. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

THE VALLEY OF THE SHADOW. By Hanns Lilje. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

At first glance two sombre titles, these chosen by a Jesuit priest and a Lutheran bishop who both suffered the extremes of hardship as prisoners of the Gestapo. But, looking deeper, it becomes at once apparent that it is the Christian who can face and not flee from ruins, and the Christian who "will fear no evil" in the Valley of the Shadow.

These books differ widely from one another and yet are profitably read together. For the outstanding feature of them both, though so differently expressed, is the way in which a Christian can use a situation of totalitarian barbarism and attacks on personality and turn it to great and good account. Hanns Lilje has written a calm and objective story of prison life in Germany during the closing years of the war. Among great companions, very many of whom were executed, he remained, by the grace of God, in full control of a situation that inexorably enslaved his captors. In the closing days of the

war it became more and more clear that the Gestapo could not evade the ultimate logic of its system, "as a merry-go-round with its organ will go on playing in the midst of a fire until the flames reach it". But men of the stature of its prisoners were building beyond the reach of flames.

There is some writing of great beauty in this book, notably, perhaps, the account of a Christmas Eve celebration of Holy Communion in a prison cell, or the description of a prison at Tegel where the bishop expected execution. "In this modern prison my cell was smaller than that in the Lehrterstrasse. It was only five paces wide; but it was quite clean, and in these silent days of autumn, when the sun shone through the bars, it had something of the austere beauty of a monk's cell . . . the stream of time flowed on quietly and majestically towards God."

Fr Riquet's book is not the mystical contemplation of a situation of this kind, but is the outcome of the same extreme suffering poured out in a series of sermons preached and broadcast from Notre Dame in the Lent of 1946. All his hard-gained knowledge of living in Dachau and Mauthausen make his commentary on the post-war world a true and objective one. But where one might have expected bitterness, once again there is control of the situation, and, in place of bitterness, an impassioned, Johannine appeal for Christian charity "not in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth". Let him be quoted: "So, in the face of this convulsed, torn, hate-ridden world, there is, for the Christian, one attitude and one only which is consistent with his Christianity and which unites him to all men of good-will: to love, to love increasingly and in spite of everything, every living man—our own countrymen first, but through them all the rest, all God's creatures, all of whom God loves—and to love them as ourselves."

Among many contemporary evils there are two which Fr Riquet attacks especially brilliantly, the "selfish and morbid fear of risks" and "the Scapegoat Mystique" by which totalitarianism kills responsibility and awareness of guilt by its savage and indiscriminate choice of scapegoats for every misfortune. These two evils are perhaps the most direct enemies of the Christian love which he preaches and in whose power the Christian may indeed "face the ruins" unafraid.

PAUL BURROUGH.

---

CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM AND THE NATURAL WORLD. By Joseph Dalby. James Clarke and Co. 7s. 6d.

Dr Dalby has written a very good book on Christian mysticism. He is concerned to kindle our interest in the saints and writers whom he loves, and to vindicate them from the charge of neglecting the natural world and the practical duties of Christianity for the enjoyment of a private and ecstatic experience of union with God. Not all of them can be altogether cleared. But Dr Dalby has washed the faces of some rather forbidding people, and made them as pre-

sentable as possible to an age suspicious of contemplation and engrossed in affairs.

It is delightful to find the persuasive Mr Huxley firmly handled and put in his place. His novel, *Grey Eminence*, is a magnificent and misleading book: magnificent, in its capacity to enthrall any reader with the least dash of mysticism in his make-up; misleading, in its thesis that preoccupation with our Lord is a perversion of mystical experience. Dr Dalby has no difficulty in showing that despite the debt of the Christian mystics to Plotinus, their life and thought were rooted in the redeeming work of God in Christ.

The chapter on the medieval English mystics is the best thing in the book. Doubtless we have missed much if we have not read St John of the Cross; there is no mistaking the impression he has made on Dr Dalby. But he must excuse us if we prefer the charm of the English Lady Julian, and with stubborn insularity admit to our shelves no Spaniard except Cervantes.

It seems a pity that there is no reference to the Cambridge Platonists. It is difficult to be quite certain, for the book has no index, but neither John Smith nor Peter Sterry appears to be mentioned. And the unlucy Kierkegaard, surely fired by the love of God, and worthy to be placed alongside St Augustine in his intellectual treatment of mystical passion, is excluded by implication in the sad sentence: "The modern theological revival, both Protestant and Catholic, has little sympathy with anything like pietism and is very much aware of the dangers of mysticism." We always thought that it was precisely the pietism of Kierkegaard which brought down Barth's criticism on the head of his acknowledged master.

But doubtless Dr Dalby will write again, and we may yet have a study of Kierkegaard as sympathetic and clear-headed as that accorded to other mystics in this charming book.

A. C. Scupholme.

---

The Conducting of Retreats. By J. Wareham. Mowbrays. 5s.

During this century two movements have made marked progress in the life of the Church—the liturgical movement, primarily concerned with corporate worship, and the retreat movement, which has to do with personal religion. These movements are not contrary the one to the other, but are supplementary and calculated to maintain an important balance in the life of devotion.

Canon Wareham's book is concerned with retreats for layfolk. It is a book written in an easy style with touches of humour which are always to the point. What he has to say is the outcome of a long and varied experience, and few are more qualified to advise us about the conducting of retreats for the Anglican laity. It is a book to be read and pondered not only by those who are new to the conduct of retreats, but by the more experienced too with a view to confirming or correcting their own procedure and methods.

The importance of simplicity is stressed, the careful choice of words so as to be understood by ordinary people ("threepenny

words, rather than sixpenny ones"). Indeed, this book itself is an admirable example of putting things well and clearly.

Anything like turning retreats into pleasant week-ends, or combining them with conferences, the aim of which is so different, meets with unqualified disapproval. Yet the day is so planned, according to this book, that there is no danger of the retreatant (Canon Wareham inclines to favour the word "exercitant") mooning away the time. It is just possible that some retreatants might find the suggested time-table a little overloaded: if so, it comes of a desire that spare time should be used to full advantage.

The importance of supplying enough Bibles for the retreatants is not to be overlooked. Perhaps instead of giving each retreatant a list of appropriate texts, as is here suggested, so that they can look them up in connexion with the addresses, it might meet the need just as well to put one or more Bible references on the notice board some little time before the address.

It is not easy to find anything of importance in this book to criticize, though some conductors might feel that to give retreatants a synopsis of the addresses beforehand might limit their freedom to adapt their instructions during the course of the retreat. This is the only point which seems to call for a word of criticism in this admirable book.

R. L. Wrathall, C.R.

Mirfield.

---

Verdict on Jesus. By Leslie S. R. Badham. Williams and Norgate. 9s. 6d.

Why Men Believe in Jesus Christ. By D. W. C. Ford. Lutterworth Press. 3s.

The first of these books must have been a labour of love. It bears all the marks of an author devoted to the subject. The main quotations which head each chapter, the constant references to other books and to almost every field of thought, show that the author has made notes from his wide reading to supply, with much care, argument to assist him in procuring a convincing Verdict on Jesus. All roads lead to Jesus: with certain originality the author starts along a way and Jesus is found to be the Alpha and Omega. There is a danger, however, that some may find his ways a maze; we are so long on the various paths that the splendour of the end is somewhat overshadowed. Many humanists would dispute that Jesus is cause and fulfilment of some of the paths. It is impossible to put the book down without a haunting sense of the dominance of Him whom "we believe shall come to be our Judge".

*Why Men Believe in Jesus Christ* is a simpler attempt to put over the main beliefs of Christians, or of some Christians. These books share in common the new tension which has arisen from the desire to believe in the Bible as the Word of God on the part of those whose Biblical studies have been largely determined by critical studies concerning dates, authorship and analysis of sources. Both

books labour to exhibit the Bible, not as a book requiring a verdict from us, but as one imposing a verdict and conviction on those who read it. Where it suits the writers, appeal is made to Holy Scripture without any reference to authorship or questions about the historical genuineness of the words or events. However, there is no consistency, and where certain events or words do not suit them they are dismissed, or claims are made with undue dogmatism, particularly in the second book, *e.g.* "Actually his work [St Luke's] did not appear till about the year 80" (p. 67). This would be seriously disputed by many. And finally, belief in the Bible as the Word of God seems to provide authority for very differing estimates of Christian faith, order and practice; we all now believe in the Bible and all somehow find their particular beliefs and practices reflected in the source. In place of "private-judgment" we are all in danger of "sect-judgment", and Biblical religion, with its inescapable doctrine of the Church, is forcing us to reconsider both the authority of the Bible and of the Church.

C. J. Gardner.

Wantage.

---

La Vie de S. Antoine. By Louis Bouyer. Editions de Fontenelle, Abbaye S. Wandrille.

Among liberal scholars fifty years ago it took a bold man to assert that St Athanasius wrote the *Life of St Antony*. To-day all that is changed: so common is the acceptance of the Athanasian authorship and the consequent acceptance of the comparatively first-hand nature of the document that Father Bouyer can even attempt in this book to write of Antony's ascetic and spiritual ideals. He is aware that even if we regard Athanasius as the author, we are still far from certain about the trustworthiness of the evidence. The *Life of St Antony* contains very curious features, and many things in it await explanation.

The author has written with learning and with his customary lucidity and vigour. He has undertaken to show that "the message" of St Antony is of urgent importance for modern Europe. Yet there is very little in the ascetical teaching of the *Life*, apart from some exceedingly jejune instructions in morality and the long and bizarre sermon on demons which forms the salient homily in the *Life*. It is one of the authentic signs that this document is close to the Coptic and primitive tradition when we find this absence of that ascetical theorizing so characteristic of the Origenist and later Greek and Latin ascetics. And the effort to show the "relevance" of a document to modern needs is almost certain to incline one to read back later thinking into a source which hardly contains it. For example, he argues that at a certain stage in the ascetic's progress the ascetic sees directly reproduced in his own life the life of Christ: and in this light we must understand Antony's conflicts with Satan. Father Bouyer even thinks Antony's choice of tombs as his dwelling to be a conscious reminiscence of the Gadarene demoniac in the Gospel (pp. 107-8). To this theory we may remark, (1) the theory of an

ascetical progress is nowhere plain in the *Life*, (2) the *Life* bears singularly few traces that Antony conceived his asceticism as a representation of Christ's life, (3) the notion of a conscious representation of the Gadarene demoniac is not borne out by the evidence. In some ways the *Life* is not so much interesting because it contains the seeds of future developments as for what it does not contain. We find in it hardly any of the marks of the speculative theories of the Greek ascetics.

The book contains much material worthy of attention by the student of primitive asceticism. It ends with a long and interesting appendix upon Christian demonology.

Owen Chadwick.

Trinity Hall,
Cambridge.

---

The Church in the Christian Roman Empire. Volume I. By J. R. Palanque, G. Bardy and P. de Labriolle. Translated from the French by Ernest C. Messenger. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 25s.

The English translation of the Fliche-Martin *Histoire de l'Église* is carried a step farther with the first of Dr Messenger's four volumes entitled *The Church in the Roman Empire*. When complete the four volumes will cover two in the French, vols. III and IV in the *Histoire*; these were published in 1936, and between them they survey the period from the peace of the Church under Constantine to the election of Gregory the Great. The present volume carries the translation as far as the Council of Constantinople in 382.

The text and arrangement of the original are unaltered, except for the addition of some few translator's footnotes, clearly marked. The reader can, for the most part, forget he is reading a translation, which is a tribute to Dr Messenger's care and skill. But occasionally he is shaken by a curious intrusion of a future tense, where neither the context nor the idiom of the French would appear to require it (*e.g.*, p. 243); and a paragraph on Hilary of Poitiers on p. 281 seems to have escaped revision. The student will value the general and particular bibliographies at the end, and the exhaustive references in footnotes to the European literature of persons and subjects. He could desire no better introduction to the study of his sources.

If this is history at its most critical and exact, it is also at its least attractive, partly because the fourth century is a bleak and terrible one on which to work. If the historian must mention everybody who has a name, every council, every creed, every theological book and pamphlet, his work becomes a catalogue and guide to the literature of the Arian controversy; and thus may this volume, not unfairly, be described. For apart from 69 pages on the Constantinian peace, and a refreshing chapter on Christianity and Paganism in the middle of the century, we have politico-theological disputation all the way. The authors have striven hard to bring out the subtle shades of profession between the conflicting parties; but without constant

reference to their writings these must remain largely incomprehensible. The men of stature—Hosius, Athanasius, Liberius, Hilary—stand out by the bare mention of their deeds; they are never "written up"; there are no heroes in this sort of history. The reader who has grown up alongside of the League of Nations, U.N.O., and the Security Council will find the technique of General Councils, Peace Manifestos, and the exile of deviationists all dismally familiar. The Encyclical Letter of Sardica, which condemns the admission of "Marcellus, Athanasius and other criminals" to communion, is of the same journalistic school as a *Pravda* leading article. And here lies the crowning glory of this book: it is history and it is realistic: it leaves the fourth century odious.

G. R. Dunstan.

Sutton Courtney,
Berkshire.

---

The Man from Nazareth. By H. E. Fosdick. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

Whatever Dr Fosdick sets out to do, he does well. In *The Man from Nazareth* he has attempted to draw a portrait of the historic Jesus, not directly, but as He might have seemed to His contemporaries. The reader is invited to see Jesus through the eyes of the various groups of which first-century Palestine was composed. Dr Fosdick uses the knowledge which research has built up to portray the characteristics of each group and to suggest how the teaching and personality of Jesus must have seemed to them.

Though written in a popular and sometimes rhetorical style, the book conveys a good and, in the main, accurate picture of the mental outlook of the time and country, and a clear picture of the ethic and personality of Jesus of Nazareth, as Dr Fosdick sees Him. Those who are interested in Jesus as a historic figure may find much here to deepen their interest and perhaps lead them to the frontier of faith. Those, on the other hand, who believe in the Christ of the Creeds should be warned that they will find much that may repel them, not so much that will deepen faith and understanding. Apart from that, it will strike many as odd that so much Rabbinic literature of a later date should be accepted and quoted as good evidence, while our own Matthew receives most critical appraisal. It is odd, too, that the story of the woman taken in adultery should receive greater credence than the gospel in a few copies of which it appears. One cannot help feeling the bias of a modern mind seeking for a Jesus acceptable to modernity. And indeed, the dynamic, aggressive, exuberant Jesus of these pages is but a twentieth-century hero, and this book for all its skill and genuine devotion to Jesus, but another apocryphal gospel. What a pity it is that so much time and energy should be wasted in striving to look beyond what God has given!

J. A. Fisher,

Peterborough.

DAVID CAIRNS. AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY. With a memoir by D. M. Baillie. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

Principal Cairns's autobiographical reminiscences cover only the first half of his long life—*i.e.*, up to about 1900. They are charmingly written, and convey a vivid impression of the Border country and of Scottish church life in the latter part of Queen Victoria's reign. Prof. D. M. Baillie sketches in the rest of the picture in an introductory memoir, dealing especially with Cairns's contribution to theological thought. A selection of his letters is given at the end of the book; these are interesting, but what has come before will have led the reader to expect to find more variety in them.

---

## CORRECTION

On p. 389 of the October number an unfortunate printing mishap occurred in the review of *Early Christian Creeds*. The fourth line from the bottom of that page (beginning "Constantinopolitan") should have read as follows: "of the dismissal of that evidence by Dr Badcock. The expansion of . . ."

---

# BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: *Religious Sisters: Foundations and Adaptations* (15s.); F. Sherwood Taylor, *St Albert Patron of Scientists* (1s.); Ian Hislop, O.P., *The Anthropology of St Thomas* (1s.).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: G. W. Bromiley, *Nicholas Ridley* (9d.); Michael Hennell, *William Wilberforce* (9d.).

DACRE PRESS: L. S. Thornton, C.R., *Revelation and the Modern World* (30s.).

FABER: Charles Williams, *He Came Down from Heaven and the Forgiveness of Sins* (16s.).

HAMMOND, HAMMOND AND CO.: J. H. Oldham, H. Westman, J. A. Mack, and Sir W. Garrett, *People at Work* (Present Question Conference) (2s. 6d.).

HUNGARIAN CHURCH PRESS (BUDAPEST): *Five Years of Hungarian Protestantism, 1945-1950* (n.p.).

HUTCHINSONS: Thomas Corbishley, *Roman Catholicism* (7s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: Constance M. Parker and Richard J. Hall, *The Church is a Family* (3s. 6d.).

ROUTLEDGE AND KEGAN PAUL: Georg Misch, *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity* (2 vols., 42s.); Georg Misch, *The Dawn of Philosophy: A Philosophical Primer* (25s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: John R. H. Moorman, *Saint Francis of Assisi* (7s. 6d.); Robert W. Paterson, *Overcoming Handicap* (3s. 6d.); Gertrude E. Quinton, *Scientific and Religious Knowledge* (8s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K./N.S.: S. M. Gibbard, S.S.J.E., *To-morrow's Church* (6s. 6d.).

UNITED SOCIETY FOR CHRISTIAN LITERATURE: H. Pakenham-Walsh, *Lights and Shades of Christendom*, Vol. II, A.D. 1000 to 1556 (Rs. 7-0-0).

*Printed in Great Britain by*
*Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher*